

72e



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,122	11/29/2000	Tapio Mansikkaniemi	017.38961X00	9055
20457	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873			SAX, STEVEN PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/725,122

Applicant(s)

MANSIKKANIEMI ET AL.

Examiner

Steven P. Sax

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 28-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The remarks filed 4/28/05 have been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-23 and 28-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godfrey et al (6463463) and Barnett et al (6369840).

4. Regarding claim 1, Godfrey et al show an electronic calendar system (column 3 lines 40-45, column 4 lines 17-30) with: a plurality of wireless devices (column 4 lines 58-63, column 7 lines 40-43), an access point in wireless communication with the wireless devices (column 3 lines 20-38, column 7 lines 35-50), a server connected to the access point (column 7 lines 30-45), with the wireless devices being connected to the server through the access point in order to equally retrieve calendar data service (column 7 lines 39-5, column 8 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 1-15, Figure 1). Godfrey et al do not specifically mention that the wireless devices are operating in a group such that the calendar is a group calendar which each of the devices are able to modify, but

Art Unit: 2174

do mention efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show wireless devices operating in a group such that the calendar is a group calendar which each of the devices are able to modify (Figures 8, 21, 22, column 3 lines 55-61, column 10 lines 40-55, column 21 lines 4-35 and 55-67, column 22 lines 1-15 and 40-60) for efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users. It would have been obvious to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users.

5. Regarding claim 2, the network is the Internet (Godfrey et al column 7 lines 38-42).

6. Regarding claim 3, a device may be connected through a second access point (Godfrey et al column 7 lines 30-40, column 4 lines 50-66).

7. Regarding claim 4, a global address server is connected to the access (Godfrey et al column 7 lines 25-40).

8. Regarding claim 5, the data is retrieved from the server by the wireless devices (Godfrey et al column 8 lines 25-32).

9. Regarding claim 6, calendar and data are retrieved from the server by wireless devices authenticated to be a member of the group (Godfrey et al column 12 lines 57-65). The obviousness to combine the group calendar feature of the Barnett et al reference is stated in paragraph 4 of this Office Action.

10. Regarding claim 7, in addition to that mentioned for claim 6, the authentication is done by the user (Godfrey et al column 12 lines 57-65).

11. Regarding claim 8, the calendar is displayed on the wireless devices having dates listed in linear fashion (Godfrey et al Figure 10). The obviousness to combine the group calendar feature of the Barnett et al reference is stated in paragraph 4 of this Office Action.

12. Regarding claim 9, in addition to that mentioned for claim 8, Godfrey et al do not specifically go into the details of different colors for calendar entries, but do mention presenting calendar entries for easy recognition and access (column 16 lines 11-35). Furthermore, Barnett et al present data on a user interfaces in different colors for easy recognition and access (column 13 lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would present calendar entries for easy recognition and access.

13. Regarding claim 10, in addition to that mentioned for claim 8, the display changes when a new entry is typed on the keyboard (Godfrey et al column 9 lines 52-62 for example).

14. Regarding claim 11, the calendar data may partly be originated from another application of the server (like the e-mail application in Godfrey et al column 10 lines 25-40). The obviousness to combine the group calendar feature of the Barnett et al reference is stated in paragraph 4 of this Office Action.

15. Claim 12 shows the same features as claim 1 (note that the wireless devices forming a family is synonymous with the wireless devices forming a group) and is rejected for the same reasons.

16. Regarding claim 13, in addition to the aforementioned, each devices has individual calendar data only accessible by itself (Godfrey et al column 12 lines 57-65).

17. Regarding claims 14, the server also has personal data that is accessed equally (Godfrey et al column 8 lines 45-56).

18. Regarding claim 15, in addition to that mentioned for claim 14, Godfrey et al do not specifically say the personal data is used in forming the family or group calendar, but do mention efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless

users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show using personal data to form the family or group calendar (column 3 lines 55-61, column 10 lines 40-55, column 21 lines 4-35 and 55-67, column 22 lines 1-15 and 40-60) for efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users. It would have been obvious to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users

19. Regarding claim 16, different weekly and daily views may be available in linear fashion (Godfrey et al Figures 6, 10-13). The obviousness to combine the group calendar feature of the Barnett et al reference is stated in paragraph 4 of this Office Action.

20. Regarding claim 17, in addition to that mentioned for claim 12, note explicitly that the calendar of Godfrey et al is displayed on each of the wireless devices (column 7 lines 39-5, column 8 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 1-15).

21. Claim 18, the devices are connected through an access point (Godfrey et al column 7 lines 30-40, column 4 lines 50-66).

22. Regarding claim 19, in addition to that mentioned for claim 18, the access point is connected via the Internet (Godfrey et al column 7 lines 38-42).

23. Regarding claim 20, a global address server is connected to the access (Godfrey et al column 7 lines 25-40).

24. Regarding claim 21, in addition to that mentioned for claim 12, Godfrey et al do not specifically mention the notice board data, but do mention efficient communication of data to the users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show the notice board data for efficient communication of data to the users (column 5 lines 44-65, column 10 lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of data to the users.

25. Regarding claim 22, the server also has personal data that is accessed equally (Godfrey et al column 8 lines 45-56).

26. Regarding claim 23, in addition to that mentioned for claim 1, note again the gateway system from the terminal with identifier to the communication service via the access point (column 7 lines 35-43, column 10 lines 53-67), and browser with configuration tools (column 10 lines 45-65).

27. Regarding claim 28, in addition to that mentioned for claim 6, note that the group calendar of Barnett et al is such that a member of the group provides a command to change content of the group calendar so that the other members receive the latest information (column 10 lines 43-54).



28. Regarding claim 29, in addition to that mentioned for claim 6, note that Godfrey et al mentions the private calendar (column 8 lines 23-40).

29. Regarding claim 30, in addition to that mentioned for claim 29, Godfrey et al do not specifically mention an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in the notice board, but do mention efficient communication of data to the users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in the notice board for efficient communication of data to the users (column 5 lines 44-65, column 10 lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of data to the users.

30. Regarding claim 31, in addition to that mentioned for claim 30, the event may be originated from another application of the server (like the e-mail application in Godfrey et al column 10 lines 25-40).

31. Regarding claim 32, in addition to that mentioned for claim 12, note that the group calendar of Barnett et al is such that a member of the group provides a command to change content of the group calendar so that the other members receive the latest information (column 10 lines 43-54).

32. Regarding claim 33, in addition to that mentioned for claim 12, note that Godfrey et al mentions the private calendar (column 8 lines 23-40).

33. Regarding claim 34, in addition to that mentioned for claim 33, Godfrey et al do not specifically mention an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in a notice board, but do mention efficient communication of data to the users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in the notice board for efficient communication of data to the users (column 5 lines 44-65, column 10 lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of data to the users.

34. Regarding claim 35, in addition to that mentioned for claim 34, the event may be originated from another application (like the e-mail application in Godfrey et al column 10 lines 25-40).

35. Regarding claim 36, in addition to that mentioned for claim 17, note that the group calendar of Barnett et al is such that a member of the group provides a command to change content of the group calendar so that the other members receive the latest information (column 10 lines 43-54).

36. Regarding claim 37, in addition to that mentioned for claim 17, note that Godfrey et al mentions the private calendar (column 8 lines 23-40).

37. Regarding claim 38, in addition to that mentioned for claim 37, Godfrey et al do not specifically mention an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in a notice board, but do mention efficient communication of data to the users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in the notice board for efficient communication of data to the users (column 5 lines 44-65, column 10 lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of data to the users.

38. Regarding claim 39, in addition to that mentioned for claim 38, the event may be originated from another application (like the e-mail application in Godfrey et al column 10 lines 25-40).

39. Regarding claim 40, in addition to that mentioned for claim 21, note that the group calendar of Barnett et al is such that a member of the group provides a command to change content of the group calendar so that the other members receive the latest information (column 10 lines 43-54).

Art Unit: 2174

40. Regarding claim 41, in addition to that mentioned for claim 21, note that Godfrey et al mentions the private calendar (column 8 lines 23-40).

41. Regarding claim 42, in addition to that mentioned for claim 41, Godfrey et al do not specifically mention an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in a notice board, but do mention efficient communication of data to the users. Furthermore, Barnett et al do show an event placed in the group calendar is also placed in the notice board for efficient communication of data to the users (column 5 lines 44-65, column 10 lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Godfrey et al, because it would provide efficient communication of data to the users.

42. Regarding claim 43, in addition to that mentioned for claim 42, the event may be originated from another application (like the e-mail application in Godfrey et al column 10 lines 25-40).

43. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant discusses whether the 'push' architecture of Godfrey et al fulfills the equal access recitation in the claims. But note that in fact through this architecture does allow equal ability of the wireless devices to retrieve the data from what would originally be a common access source point. Furthermore, does show the group calendar ability in which each of the devices have equal access to the calendar data.

The combination of Barnett into Godfrey et al is valid in order to provide efficient communication of calendar information among the wireless users. In fact, the push architecture of Godfrey et al supports this motivation by maintaining the efficient communication among all the devices.

44. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P. Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*

  
CHIEF OF  
PATENT EXAMINER